

and pitfalls will be numerous. And the likelihood of long term success and stability will be diminished. If we are successful in our mission to remove Saddam, a successor will need to be determined. The likelihood of Iraq becoming a democracy in our lifetime is unlikely. Even with the ousting of Saddam, we must be prepared and accepting of a moderate Arab government similar to others in the region.

The cost of rebuilding the country will be enormous, both in terms of money and manpower. From ensuring the Iraqi children can obtain clean water to establishing a forum for a free and open government to thrive. Are we willing to take those costs solely upon ourselves?

We must also be ready to focus our resources on the stability of the entire Middle East region and Muslim world. We need a comprehensive policy of economic engagement, one that includes expanded trade.

We should consider a trade benefits program similar to what we currently do for Africa, the Caribbean, and the Andean countries. In order to achieve long-term stability and reduce the terrorist threat, we will need to engage the entire region. And we will need our allies to assist in this engagement.

It's time to face facts. Our country is facing a troubling economy, unemployment, low growth, large national debt. Interest rates can't go much lower.

If we continue to disregard the concerns of other Security Council members and move forward with only a small band of countries that support immediate military action, the lion's share of the costs and military burden will fall on America's shoulders. Where will this money come from. How long must our troops be away from their families—months, years, decades? We must be fully prepared for this scenario before we move forward.

We are all in agreement that Saddam Hussein is a bad man and the threat he poses cannot be disregarded. While I unequivocally support removing Hussein from power, knowing that he is a peril to the region and the world, I urge that we move forward with a strong coalition of support. The clock is running down, but there is still time to gather our allies. Our long term interests—on every front—will be best achieved by standing together, united behind our common goal of eliminating terrorism and keeping our countries safe.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALEXANDER). The Senator from Utah.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period for morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I listened with interest to my friend from

Montana. While I had not prepared a response, I feel, nonetheless, moved to make a response.

My colleague from Montana made the point that Saddam Hussein must be removed and then suggested that we need more time and we should be willing to grant more time. This is, indeed, the position of many people in the United Nations. They keep saying just another week, just another month if necessary. The Senator from Montana used that same timeframe.

In my opinion, we do not have that option. In my opinion, we have two options, not three. The two options are either to go ahead or to come home. The option of staying in place and allowing the inspections to go on for an indeterminate period of time is not a viable option.

The reason for that is that our troops are not where they are on anything like a permanent status. They are there at the indulgence of foreign governments that have allowed them to come in with the firm understanding that they will be there very briefly. In the countries where they are currently bivouacked, they are simply there, on the edge of moving forward.

If we now say to those countries, the host countries that are harboring our troops, we are going to leave them there for an indefinite period of time while the inspectors continue to poke around Iraq, I expect that country after country will say: No. We did not bargain for American troops in these numbers on our territory for an indefinite period of time.

If you are not moving ahead into Iraq, withdraw your forces and go home. And if we do withdraw our forces and go home, it is clear Saddam Hussein will not be removed until he dies. And he may very well die in his bed, because once the United States has sent the signal to the world that we are prepared to do whatever is necessary to remove this brutal dictator and then we back down and bring our troops home, we can never put them back in those places again. No host government currently allowing American forces on its soil will say OK, now that Saddam Hussein has nuclear weapons, you can come back and be on our soil and make us a target for those nuclear weapons. No. We have two choices. We can either move ahead or we can come home.

It is not the most sympathetic character in Shakespeare. A comment made by Lady Macbeth becomes appropriate here. "If it were done when 'tis done, then 'twere well it were done quickly."

If we are going to remove Saddam Hussein, we must do it quickly. And if we are not, we should not leave our troops in their present posture for an indefinite period of time while inspectors poke around on a scavenger hunt in Iraq.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, obviously, the major conversation today is about how we might successfully disarm Sad-

dam Hussein of the weapons of mass destruction, which many of us still believe are there in Iraq and pose a serious threat, not only to ourselves but to allies and others.

I certainly do not minimize the importance of dealing with this issue. In fact, as my constituents know, I voted for the resolution last fall authorizing the President to use force if that became necessary. I still support that position.

I think the President ought to have that authority from Congress. I am grateful to him for coming to Congress and asking for that kind of backing. When I voted to give him that authority, I did not mean, of course, necessarily that authority would be used regardless of other circumstances. And certainly, over the past several months, we have seen a concerted effort to try to resolve the problem of Iraq short of using military force.

In fact, the President's own words, deserve being repeated; that is, that he did not welcome or look forward to the use of military force to solve this problem. He hoped it would be resolved without using force. I applaud him for making those statements and hope he is still committed to that proposition.

I am concerned, still, as are many Americans, that we may see a military conflict in the coming days, and that every effort to try to resolve this matter, diplomatically and politically, has not yet been exhausted. I know the administration is working on it.

As one Member of this body, I encourage them to continue doing so. I do not mean indefinitely, obviously. There are obviously points at which you have to accept the fact that there is not going to be the kind of cooperation you would like to have. I certainly would not suggest we ought to go on indefinitely here at all, but I do believe our allies and friends—principally Great Britain, which has been remarkably steadfast in their loyalty to the U.S. Government on this issue—need to be listened to, that their advice and counsel have value and weight. And if there are ways in which you can craft resolutions which would build support at the U.N. Security Council, then we ought to try to do that. That does not mean you go on weeks trying to sort that out. But I hope every effort is being made to fashion just such an arrangement that would allow us to deal with Saddam Hussein.

I happen to believe, in the absence of the threat of force, I don't think diplomacy would work alone, nor do I necessarily believe the threat of force, without some effort by diplomacy and politics, would necessarily work as well as we would like.

It is a combination of the threat of force and the use of diplomacy that I think has produced the significant, positive results we have seen in the last number of weeks. And the President deserves credit for that, in my view.

There is almost a sense of victory occurring here. He may be the most critical voice regarding this progress that has been made, but, nonetheless, I think progress is being made.

Mr. President, I want to shift quickly, if I can, however, to the cost of reconstruction. I know the conversation is whether or not there will be a war. Let's assume, for a second, that comes. As regrettable as it is—and we hope it will, obviously, be done at a minimal loss of innocent lives and the lives of the men and women in uniform—I am deeply troubled by the fact this administration has been unwilling to come before Congress to share with us their best and worst-case scenarios in terms of the cost of reconstruction in Iraq.

Certainly, I do not expect, nor should anyone, that the administration would be able to tell you with any great deal of specificity exactly what those costs would be. But you are not going to convince anybody in this Chamber, or most Americans, that the administration has not projected some cost figures on what it is going to cost us to rebuild Iraq, either alone or with the cooperation of others around the globe.

The reason I say that is because I noticed the other day that the administration had solicited bids from four or five major U.S. corporations to bid on an almost \$1 billion contract for reconstruction or partial reconstruction in Iraq.

I am convinced that those firms had to have some knowledge of what the bid was all about in order to make it. What concerns me is that there may be people in those corporations who know far more about what the costs may be than the representatives and taxpayers of this country, who will ultimately be asked to pay the bill.

I was stunned, when we had a hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee just a few days ago on this very subject matter, at the cost of reconstruction, that the administration refused to send any witnesses up to share with the committee, under the leadership of the distinguished chairman of that committee, Senator RICHARD LUGAR of Indiana—that the administration refused to even step forward and share with the committee their general thoughts on what may be the costs.

How is it that four or five corporations can apparently have access to information and yet the Congress of the United States does not? The four or five corporations were Bechtel, the Fluor Corporation, Halliburton, owned by Kellogg, Brown and Root, the Lewis Berger Group, the Parson Group. Those, I believe, are the names of the corporations invited to bid on the reconstruction contracts.

If you are telling these corporations about what the costs may be, and what may be involved, and yet you can't let Members of Congress know—particularly the committee charged with the responsibility—ultimately, I think that is a mistake.

There was a report conducted, I think by the Brookings Institution, with such distinguished Americans as James Schlesinger and others, that made an analysis of the post-cost figures on reconstruction. They all made the similar recommendation. You have to step forward.

As our former colleague, John Glenn, used to say: If you want the American public to be supportive of actions like this, they have to be involved in the takeoff as well as the landing.

I think his words, that I heard him repeat on numerous occasions, have particular value in talking about this debate. This is not to suggest that everyone is going to endorse the numbers. But you need to let the American public know what they are in for, so that there is some understanding of what this involvement is going to cost us. I think you are going to do far better at winning support ultimately for these figures if you share your ideas.

Again, no one is expecting you are going to have to be wedded to these numbers. But you are not going to build the kind of domestic support you need for a number of years on the reconstruction of Iraq if you do not begin to share with the American public what sort of cost figures we are talking about.

It is estimated by some groups already that the cost could be at a low figure of \$20 billion a year. The cost of the war, of course, we can't get any numbers on. We don't have any numbers on how many of our U.S. military personnel might have to be stationed in Iraq for how long a period of time during the period of occupation.

Let me share with you from the Brookings report. Even assuming, they said, little war-related damage—we hope that is the case—the reconstruction requirements in Iraq will be very substantial. Estimates of the requirement vary considerably from as little as \$25 billion over a multiyear period to as much as \$300 billion over 10 years. It is estimated that repairing and restoring Iraq's electrical power grid to its pre-1990 level would cost as much as \$20 billion and that the short-term repairs for the oil industry would cost about \$5 billion. Additional reconstruction requirements involve water, sanitation, transportation, and other infrastructure.

I bring this up not because I am trying to persuade people they ought not to be for using force, if that becomes necessary, but just to suggest that if you don't involve people and share with them what the estimated cost of this may be, you will be in trouble.

Let me tell you what I suspect is really behind a lot of this. As I am speaking on the floor of this Chamber, the budget committees of the Congress are meeting. They are talking about the cost of Government over the next number of years—tax policy, spending policy, what they will be. The estimates now for the deficit are hovering around \$400 billion a year. I don't find

it merely coincidental that the administration is refusing to share with us how much this war may cost, how much the reconstruction may cost at a time we are also considering the budget. Why is it they won't share these numbers? Is it because they don't want the Budget Committee or this Chamber, which will vote next week on the budget, to have before it some idea of what taxpayers will be asked to shoulder as a result of this involvement? Again, you will not convince me that those numbers don't exist. They do exist.

It is outrageous that the administration won't step forward and say: Here is our best estimate, worst case, best case. Regardless of how you feel about this conflict, potential conflict—again, I voted with the President to support the use of force if necessary—where are the Members of the Senate? Why don't they stand up for the Senate when it comes to the budget—we are the ones being asked to vote on this—and be as demanding as I am about sharing these numbers? I would think every single Member of this body, regardless of how you feel about the war, would want to know what the cost may be, so that when you cast a vote either in the Budget Committee or on the floor of the Senate next week, you would have some idea of what the implications are going to be. Without having that information, I don't know how you will vote for some of these other matters, knowing that the cost could be billions and billions of dollars in the coming 5 or 10 years.

Maybe I am the only one who feels this way. I suspect I am not. I suspect there is a tremendous concern growing that we are digging a very deep hole for ourselves financially with these massive tax cuts and massive spending going on. I find it more than ironic that some of the strongest advocates for this budget only a few short years ago were standing here begging us to vote for a constitutional amendment to balance the budget and, but for one vote, we would have written it into the Constitution. Now they stand before us and tell us deficits don't matter and that we don't even have to share with you the estimated costs of our involvement in Iraq.

My hope is that in these coming days before the end of this week or the first part of next week, the administration might share through some vehicle, if not before a congressional committee then some other forum, what the costs are apt to be so that next week when we vote on the budget, we can include those numbers in the estimated burden the American taxpayer may be asked to shoulder.

I am deeply worried that we are digging a very deep hole for ourselves, and we are not being honest and square with the American public about what those implications will be.

I yield the floor.

TORTURE IS A CRIME

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to take a moment today to speak about an issue that has been discussed in the press recently, which is the use of torture to obtain information from persons who are suspected of being terrorists.

It is well-established that torture is a violation of international law, by which our country is bound. It is also a violation of our own laws. Yet commentators have been quoted by the press saying that in certain limited circumstances, when the threat is a possible terrorist attack, the use of torture is justified. Some have even suggested that since torture is used, why not simply admit it and accept it as a fact of life?

These are not easy questions. Who does not want to do everything possible to save innocent lives? We all do. But the United States is a nation of laws, and I reject the view that torture, even in such compelling circumstances, can be justified. I would hope all countries would uphold their obligations under international law, but that is not the case. It is the 21st century, and yet torture is used by government security forces in some 150 countries.

We have often spoken about how important it is not to let the terrorists win. We try not to let ourselves be intimidated. We take precautions, but we go about our daily lives.

The same holds true of the tactics terrorists use. If we don't protect the civil liberties that distinguish us from terrorists, then the terrorists have won.

Torture is among the most heinous crimes, and there is no justification for its use. One need only review history to understand why there can be no exception to torture. The torture of criminal suspects flagrantly violates the presumption of innocence on which our criminal jurisprudence is based, and confessions extracted as a result of torture are notoriously unreliable.

Also, history has shown that once an exception is made for torture, it is impossible to draw the line. If we can justify torture in the United States, then what is to prevent its use in China, Iraq, Chile, or anywhere else? If torture is justified to obtain information from a suspected terrorist, then why not torture the terrorist's wife and children, or his friends and acquaintances who may know about his activities or his whereabouts? In fact, that is what happens in many countries.

There is also the issue of what constitutes torture versus acceptable, albeit harsh, treatment.

Torture is defined in the Convention Against Torture, which the United States ratified, as "any act by which severe pain or suffering, whether physical or mental, is intentionally inflicted upon a person for such purposes as obtaining from him or a third person information or a confession . . .".

A March 4 article in the New York Times described the treatment of Af-

ghan prisoners at the Bagram air base. Two former prisoners, both of young age, recently died in U.S. military custody. Other prisoners described being forced to stand naked in a cold room for 10 days without interruption, with their arms raised and chained to the ceiling and their swollen ankles shackled. They also said they were denied sleep for days and forced to wear hoods that cut off the supply of oxygen.

I do not believe that prisoners of war, some of whom are suspected of having killed or attempted to kill Americans, should be rewarded with comforts. Harsh treatment may, at times, be justified.

However, while I cannot say whether the treatment described by these Afghan prisoners amounts to torture under international law, it does sound cruel and inhumane. The inhumane treatment of prisoners, whoever they are, is beneath a great nation. It is also illegal. That is the law whether U.S. military officers engage in such conduct themselves, or they turn over prisoners to the government agents of another country where torture is commonly used, in order to let others do the dirty work.

Some of these Afghan prisoners may be guilty of war crimes. Some may be members of al-Qaida but may have never fired a shot. Others may be completely innocent. But regardless, I was not proud when I read that article, and when I think of how often I and other Members of Congress have criticized other governments for treating prisoners that way. It undermines our reputation as a Nation of laws, it hurts our credibility with other nations, and it invites others to use similar tactics.

I am encouraged that the Department of Defense is conducting a review of the deaths of the two Afghans at Bagram, both of which were ruled homicides by an American pathologist. Those responsible for what happened must be held accountable. But I also urge the Department to review whether the interrogation techniques used there, and at other U.S. military facilities are fully consistent with international law. It should not take a homicide to reveal that prisoners in U.S. custody are being mistreated.

I yield the floor.

WELCOMING THE PRIME MINISTER OF IRELAND

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I want to take a moment to welcome the Prime Minister of Ireland, who is here today. You will notice, I have a green tie on today. I am fully aware, as most Americans are, that St. Patrick's Day is on the 17th day of March, not the 13th day of March. But when the Prime Minister of Ireland arrives here to celebrate St. Patrick's Day a little earlier this year, those of us who are of Irish descent—and even those who are not but wish they were—generally wear a little green to celebrate this festive holiday.

Prime Minister Ahern was at a lunch a little while ago hosted by the distin-

guished Speaker of the House, DENNY HASTERT. Vice President CHENEY was also in attendance representing the President, who normally would be attending an event such as this today, but, obviously, events in the Middle East made it difficult for him to get away. All of us understand that. We regret he was not able to be with us, but we fully appreciate there are other matters that require his more immediate attention.

But we thank the Prime Minister, the Taoiseach of Ireland, for him not only being here but for his tremendous work, along with Tony Blair and other political leaders in Northern Ireland, particularly Jerry Adams and David Trimble, in their efforts to try to resolve, once and for all, the political disputes that have been so devastating on the people of Northern Ireland over these last number of years. Based on conversations we have had, it would appear that we are getting very close to, hopefully, a final resolution of those issues.

So I welcome the Prime Minister and other political leaders from Ireland and Northern Ireland who have come, as they traditionally do, to celebrate St. Patrick's Day, but have made this a working holiday, if you will, to engage in further conversations on what we might do to help resolve the matters of Northern Ireland, as well as to listen to their sound advice and observations regarding the turmoil that is brewing in the Middle East.

ELIZABETH SMART AND THE NATIONAL AMBER ALERT NETWORK ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I, like all of America, was elated last night when we heard the news that the young girl from Utah, Elizabeth Smart, who had been missing for more than 9 months, had been found and reunited with her family. Most of the time, the vast majority of these stories about these girls—mostly girls who are kidnapped, abducted, stolen—end in bad news. This ended in good news.

As a father and grandfather, I really don't know the emotion of a parent who has a child stolen. An abducted child must be the worst nightmare of a parent. But this nightmare ended as I have just related.

The Justice Department says the number of children taken by strangers annually is between 3,000 and 4,000—it varies but thousands of children. Every day children are stolen. These children and their parents deserve the assistance of the American people and the helping hand of the Federal Government.

We stand ready and willing to help. We all feel so helpless when a child is kidnapped. What can we do to help? There is not very much because mostly these stories end, not like Elizabeth Smart's, they end in tragedy. For the past 2 years, Senators LEAHY, HATCH, HUTCHISON, FEINSTEIN, and others have